

Appl. No. 10/721,806
Amdt. dated December 7, 2005
Reply to Office action of October 6, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 5. This sheet, which includes Figs. 5 and 6, replaces the replacement sheet including Figs. 5 and 6 filed August 24, 2005. In Figure 5, previously identified element, midplane board 46, has been deleted.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the Office action dated October 6, 2005, in which the Examiner: 1) objected to the specification; 2) objected to the drawings; 3) rejected claims 1, 2, 7-11, 13-25 and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Manweiler et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,459,589) hereinafter "Manweiler"; 4) rejected claims 12 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Manweiler or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Manweiler in view of Creason (U.S. Pat. No. 6,594,150) hereinafter "Creason"; and 5) rejected claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manweiler.

With this Response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 10, 20, and 25.

I. OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS

The Examiner objected to the proposed amendments to Figure 5 as presented in the paper of August 22, 2005. Figure 5 has now been amended so that previously identified element, midplane board 46, has been deleted. A new replacement sheet of drawings is submitted with this paper.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 7-11, 13-25 and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Manweiler. Manweiler teaches a computer chassis supporting a midplane board that couples to a plurality of computer modules disposed in four regions. Midplane board 76 is secured to a center support 44. See Col. 3, Lines 58-61 and Figs. 3-4. Module dividers 46 and 48 are secured to the chassis and separate the chassis into areas that receive selected modules. See Col. 3, Lines 63-67, Col. 4, Lines 8-11, and Figs. 3-4. Midplane board 76 is secured to center support 44 such that connectors 78, 80 on the midplane board are in alignment with and receive corresponding connectors 68, 70 on the modules when the modules are inserted into the chassis. See Col. 5, Line 56 to Col. 6, Line 8 and Figs. 9-12.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the interface board having a first side arranged so as to couple to a first electrical component when the first electrical component is located in the first drawer and the first drawer is not

engaged with the chassis base. Support for this amendment can be found in paragraph [0018] of the Applicants' specification, which states that:

[0018] Assembly of modular components into front drawer 28 may be performed before the drawer is installed in chassis base 20. For example, a power supply module can be installed in bay 32, one or more hard drives can be installed into bay 34, and a disc drive can be installed into media module bay 36. These components are installed by sliding the components into the selected bay and engaging a connector mounted on the rear of the component with a complimentary connector on the front of mid-plane board 46.

Manweiler does not teach an interface board that can couple to a module that is disposed in a drawer that is not engaged in the chassis. Therefore, Manweiler does not anticipate amended claim 1. Claims 2 and 7-9 depend from claim 1 and are therefore also not anticipated by Manweiler.

Claim 10 has been amended to include a limitation wherein the first electrical component can be coupled to the midplane board when the first drawer is not supported by the chassis base. Support for this amendment can be found in paragraph [0018] that is reproduced above. Manweiler does not teach a midplane board that can couple to a module disposed in the first drawer when the first drawer is not disposed in the chassis. Therefore, Manweiler does not anticipate amended claim 10. Claims 11 and 13-19 depend from claim 10 and are therefore also not anticipated by Manweiler.

Claim 20 has been amended to include means for coupling a first electrical component disposed in the drawer to one side of the interface board when the drawer is not engaged with the chassis. Support for this amendment can be found in paragraph [0018] that is reproduced above. Manweiler does not teach a means for coupling an interface board to an electronic component disposed in a drawer that is not disposed in the chassis. Therefore, Manweiler does not anticipate amended claim 20. Claims 2-24 depend from claim 20 and are therefore also not anticipated by Manweiler.

Claim 25 has been amended to include a step comprising installing the first drawer into a chassis base after the first electrical component is coupled to the midplane board. Support for this amendment can be found in paragraph [0018] that is reproduced above. Manweiler does not teach a method for installing a drawer into a chassis after a component in that drawer is coupled to a midplane board. Therefore, Manweiler does not anticipate amended claim 25. Claims 27-30 depend from claim 20 and are therefore also not anticipated by Manweiler.

The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 26 as being either anticipated by Manweiler or obvious over Manweiler in view of Creason. Claim 12 depends from amended claim 10 and claim 26 depends from amended claim 25. Because claims 10 and 25 have been amended to include limitations not found in the cited art, the Examiner's rejections should be withdrawn.

Claims 12 and 26 include limitations that the midplane board is vertically attached, or mounted, to the first drawer. The Examiner identifies midplane support 44 of Manweiler as providing a vertical mount for midplane 76 to a first drawer. Manweiler clearly teaches that midplane support 44 as being included in chassis 10. Col. 3, Lines 58-61. Because chassis 10 includes midplane support 44, the midplane support, and therefore midplane 76, is attached, or mounted to, chassis 10 and not a drawer or module. Thus, Manweiler does not teach a midplane board vertically attached, or mounted, to a drawer, and cannot anticipate claims 12 or 26.

Further, it would not be obvious to attach, or mount, the midplane board of Manweiler to a drawer because module dividers 46 or 48 would prevent the midplane board from being installed into the center of the chassis. Because the combination of Manweiler and Creason as suggested by the Examiner would yield an inoperative device, the combination of Manweiler and Creason does not render obvious the scope of claims 12 or 26.

Claims 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manweiler. Claims 3-5 depend from claim 1 that, as discussed above, has

Appl. No. 10/721,806
Amdt. dated December 7, 2005
Reply to Office action of October 6, 2005

been amended to include limitations not found in Manweiler. Therefore, Manweiler can not render obvious claims 3-5.

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Derek V. Forinash
PTO Reg. No. 47,231
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400